

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

UNITED STATES, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) No. 1:23-cv-00108-LMB-JFA
)
GOOGLE LLC,)
)
Defendant.)

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SEAL**

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5, Plaintiffs respectfully submit the instant memorandum of law in support of their motion to seal Exhibit 1 to Plaintiffs' Response to Google's Status Report and the portions of the Response that disclose the contents of Exhibit 1. The information that Plaintiffs seek to seal is material Defendant Google has designated as confidential or highly confidential under the Modified Protective Order (Dkt. 203). The unredacted Response and Exhibit 1 have been filed electronically using the sealed filing events at Dkts. 1518 and 1518-1, and the redacted Response is filed on the public docket at Dkt. 1517.

Pursuant to paragraph 20 of the Modified Protective Order (Dkt. 203), through this motion Plaintiffs inform the Court of the confidentiality designations of these materials and request that the Court (1) seal portions of Plaintiffs' Response and Exhibit 1, and (2) maintain the redacted memorandum on the public docket, in order to provide Google sufficient time to provide the Court with support for the need to seal these documents. But for the requirements of the Modified Protective Order, Plaintiffs would not seek to seal these documents.

ARGUMENT

Public access to judicial records is “protected both by the common law and the First Amendment.” *Stone v. Univ. of Md. Med. Sys. Corp.*, 855 F.2d 178, 180 (4th Cir. 1988). “The common law presumes a right of the public to inspect and copy ‘all judicial records and documents.’” *Id.* However, a litigant can overcome the common-law presumption of public access by showing that it has “some significant interest that outweighs the presumption.” *Rushford v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc.*, 846 F.2d 249, 253 (4th Cir. 1988). Accordingly, before ordering the sealing of a document, a district court must “(1) provide public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the document[], and (3) provide specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal the document[] and for rejecting the alternatives.” *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000); *see also* Local Civ. R. 5(C).

Plaintiffs do not believe the information referenced in their Response or Exhibit 1 are of a type that outweighs the presumption in favor of public access. Nonetheless, because the material was designated as confidential or highly confidential by Google, Plaintiffs have filed the present motion in accordance with their obligations under paragraph 20 of the Modified Protective Order. As stated in the notice filed concurrently with this memorandum, any interested member of the public and any other party may indicate their position on the motion.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court seal Exhibit 1 to Plaintiffs’ Response to Google’s Status Report and the portions of the Response that disclose the contents of Exhibit 1.

Dated: June 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

ERIK S. SIEBERT
United States Attorney

/s/ Gerard Mene
GERARD MENE
Assistant U.S. Attorney
2100 Jamieson Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 299-3777
Facsimile: (703) 299-3983
Email: Gerard.Mene@usdoj.gov

/s/ Julia Tarver Wood
JULIA TARVER WOOD
MATTHEW R. HUPPERT
DAVID TESLICKO
MICHAEL E. WOLIN

United States Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 7100
Washington, DC 20530
Telephone: (202) 307-0077
Fax: (202) 616-8544
Email: Julia.Tarver.Wood@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States

JASON S. MIYARES
Attorney General of Virginia

/s/ Tyler T. Henry
TYLER T. HENRY
Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General of Virginia
202 North Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: (804) 692-0485
Facsimile: (804) 786-0122
Email: thenry@oag.state.va.us

Attorneys for the Commonwealth of Virginia and local counsel for the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia